

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

There is no additional fee for this Amendment because the total number of claims has been reduced and the total number of independent claims remains unchanged.

Amendment to Claims

Applicants have amended Claim 2 by adding the limitations of Claim 1. Applicants have canceled Claim 1 in view of the Amendment to Claim 2. Applicants have amended Claims 3-8 and 12-16 to depend upon a remaining claim rather than canceled Claim 1.

Applicants have amended Claim 23 by adding the limitations of Claim 18. Applicants have canceled Claim 18 in view of the Amendment to Claim 23. Applicants have amended Claims 19-22 to depend upon a remaining claim rather than canceled Claim 18.

Applicants have amended Claim 27 by adding the limitations of Claim 26. Applicants have canceled Claim 26 in view of the Amendment to

Claim 27. Applicants have amended Claim 31 to depend upon a remaining claim rather than canceled Claim 26.

Applicants have amended Claim 39 by adding the limitations of Claim 38. Applicants have canceled Claim 38 in view of the Amendment to Claim 39.

Applicants have amended Claims 17 and 25 to a method format rather than an apparatus format.

The above Amendment adds no new matter to this Patent Application.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 17 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended each of Claims 17 and 25 into method format rather than apparatus format. Applicants believe that the above Amendment overcomes the rejection of Claims 17 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3-9, 12-16, 18-22, 26, 31 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Gerber, U.S. Patent 4,653,373. Applicants

Serial No.: 10/722,772

believe that this rejection is rendered moot in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 10, 11, 23, 24, 27-30 and 38 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants believe that the Office Action contains a typographical error and that Claim 39 is objected to rather than Claim 38, as stated on Page 3 of the Office Action. **However, if there is not a typographical error and in fact Claim 38 has only been objected to, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned, to add original Claim 38 back into this Patent Application.**

Claims 32-37 and 40-43 have been allowed.

Applicants have amended each of Claims 2, 23, 27 and 39 into independent form. All remaining claims have either been allowed or depend upon and further limit a now allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the above Amendment and remarks address each and every issue raised by the Examiner and overcome each and every objection and rejection. However, should the Examiner detect any remaining issue, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned, preferably by telephone, in an effort to expedite examination of this Patent Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas H. Pauley
Registration No. 33,295

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road; Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
TEL (847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403